

Application Number 10/807,823  
Amendment dated November 30, 2007  
Response to Office Action mailed September 7, 2007

### REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated September 7, 2007. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 5-9, 12, 16, 22, 26, 29, 31, 33, 36, 37, 40, 42, and 43. Applicant has canceled claim 2, 4, 15, 17, 23, 30, 34, 35, 39, and 41 and added new claims 44 and 45. Claims 1, 3, 5-14, 16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-33, 36-38, 40, and 42-45 are pending.

### Abstract Objection

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Abstract because Applicant included within the Abstract the phrase "are described." Applicant amends the abstract in the manner suggested by the Examiner. In particular, Applicant has removed the "are described" and "is described" language found in the previous presented Abstract. Applicant also amends the Abstract such that the Abstract comprises less than 150 words. Because the amendments bring the Abstract within MPEP 608.01(b), Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection.

### Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 4, 17, 30-31, 35-36, and 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 22, 33, and 37 to include all subject matter recited by respective allowable claims 4, 30, 35, and 41, respectively, and any intervening claims on which claims 4, 30, 35, and 41 depend. Applicant also has amended claim 9 to include all subject matter recited by respective allowable claim 17 and any pertinent intervening subject matter on which claim 17 depends, e.g., claim 15.

Consequently, claims 1, 9, 22, 33, and 37 and the claims dependent therefrom are in condition for allowance.

### Claim Objections

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, Examiner objected to claims 2, 12, 15, and 26 because of informalities found within these claims. Applicant has amended the claims (where appropriate in view of the above amendments) in line with the Examiner's suggestions. For example, the

Application Number 10/807,823  
Amendment dated November 30, 2007  
Response to Office Action mailed September 7, 2007

Examiner suggested that Applicant insert "with" in line 4 of claim 2. Applicant has canceled claim 2 but included the limitations of claim 2 in claim 1. Applicant, therefore, has amended claim 1, line 9 to insert the suggested "with" between "synchronized state." As another example, Applicant has amended claim 12 as requested. Applicant has canceled claim 15, but included the limitations of claim 15 in claim 9 in amended form to correct the Objection noted by the Examiner. Applicant 26 amended claim 26 to include the change suggested by the Examiner. Because Applicant amended the claims to accommodate all changes suggested by the Examiner, Applicant requests withdrawal of the objections to claims 2, 12, 15, and 26.

#### Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 9-14, 18-29, 32-33, 37-40, and 42-43 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rampuria et al. (US 2004/0078625). Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 22, 33, and 37 to include subject matter the Examiner indicated as allowable if not dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicant submits that this rejection is moot in view of the current amendments. Therefore, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection and prompt allowance of Applicant's claims.

#### Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-3, 5-8, 15-16, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rampuria et al. in view of Jones et al. (US 2002/0169794). However, because Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 22, 33, and 37 to include subject matter the Examiner indicated as allowable if not dependent on a rejected base claim, Applicant submits that this rejection is moot. Therefore, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection and prompt allowance of Applicant's claims.

#### New Claims:

Applicant has added independent claims 44 and 45 to the pending application. New claims 44 and 45 are substantially similar to independent claim 22, which has been amended to include subject matter the Examiner indicated as allowable. Consequently, the applied references fail to disclose or suggest the inventions defined by Applicant's new claims, and

Application Number 10/807,823  
Amendment dated November 30, 2007  
Response to Office Action mailed September 7, 2007

provide no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to arrive at the claimed inventions. No new matter has been added by the new claims.

### CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

November 30, 2007

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.  
1625 Radio Drive, Suite 300  
Woodbury, Minnesota 55125  
Telephone: 651.735.1100  
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

By:

Kent J. Sieffert  
Name: Kent J. Sieffert  
Reg. No.: 41,312